



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,401	11/28/2003	Koji Aoki	000409-072	7190
21839	7590	04/11/2006		EXAMINER
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC (INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS) POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			RUTLAND WALLIS, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B1

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,401	AOKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Rutland-Wallis	2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/04 4/28/05
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the supporting means must be shown or the feature must be canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency.

Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-4, 6, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 6, 10 and 12 the actuation of a supporting means as claimed in claim 2 and depending claims while applicants briefly refer the supporting means on page 3 line 10 of the specification there is insufficient detail shown in the drawings or detailed description in the specification of the supporting means to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to determine what applicant is referring.

With respect to claim 3 and 4 to the limitation "the first door and the second door are provided in line" it cannot be determined what the doors are supposed to be in line with or what line applicant is referring and is therefore interpreted as any line in order to further prosecute the merits of the instant application.

With respect to claim 2 the limitation "supporting the second door relative to the vehicle" this limitation is not understood as what applicant means by relative to the vehicle.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van den Boom et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,075,294)

With respect to claims 1, 5 and 7 Van den Boom teaches a vehicle door operation system for operating a first door and a second door provided to a vehicle, comprising: a sending means (conducting lines item 17 and 19 for example seen in Fig. 1) provided to either the first door or the second door for sending a request signal (data signal); a portable station (item 20) for sending an ID information in response to the request signal; a receiving means (item 15) provided to the vehicle for receiving the ID information sent from the portable station; a judging means (Van den Boom teaches comparing and determining the correct ID operation is performed within the controller see column 4 lines line 18-31) provided to the vehicle for judging whether or not the ID information sent from the portable station is correct; an object detecting means (item 30 for example) provided to the first door for detecting an object; an opening operation means (item 13) provided to the second door and operated for opening the second door; and a first control means (item 16) for switching the first door and the second door

from a locked condition to an unlocked condition when the ID information is verified as correct information by the judging means and sending an opening operation signal (sent via conductors 17 for example) from the opening operation means

With respect to claim 3 Van den Boom teaches the doors to the vehicle are in line with conductors 17 or 19 for example.

With respect to claim 9 Van den Boom teaches the first control means (item 16) provided to the vehicle is connected to the receiving means (item 15) and the sending means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following rejections to claims 2, 4, 6, 10 and 12 are as best can be understood by the examiner of record, where the supporting means is understood to be a holding means or latching mechanism in order to further prosecute the merits of the instant application

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Boom et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,075,294) in view of Okada et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,552,649)

With respect to claim 2 Van den Boom teaches the device of claim 1 Van den Boom does not teach the use of a second control means for the second door, while Van den boom teaches a latching mechanism to enable the doors to close and lock or unlock or release when the ID information is verified as correct information by the judging means, and the opening operation signal from the opening operation means is input. Okada teaches (item 76) a second controller to control the operation of a latching mechanism. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van den Boom to include an additional control means to control the latching mechanism associated with the second door in order to save power by reducing transmission length of power signals.

With respect to claim 4 Van den Boom teaches the doors to the vehicle are in line with conductors 17 or 19 for example.

With respect to claim 6 Van den Boom teaches the object detecting means is comprised of the electrical capacitance sensor for detecting a human approach.

With respect to claim 8 Van den Boom teaches the portable station carried by a user of the vehicle includes an antenna (item 24), a sending (item 21) and receiving circuit (item 22) and a key control means (items 23 and or 25). Van den Boom does not teach separate sending and receiving antennas. The use of separate antennas for transmitting and receiving is well known in the art see for example Okada et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van den Boom to include the use of two separate antennas in order to transmit and receive simultaneously for example.

With respect to claim 10 Van den Boom as modified by Okada teaches the second control means provided to the second door is connected to the opening operation means in order to operate the door when the correct ID is received.

With respect to claims 11 and 12 Van den Boom does not teach the location of the doors are provided on the same side of the vehicle. The location of two doors on the same side of the vehicle is well known in the art. Okada teaches a door locking system with doors located on the same side of the vehicle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van den Boom in view of Okada in order to lock the doors of a vehicle with more than two doors.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Steriner teaches a device similar to that of the claimed invention (U.S. Pat. No. 6,577,226), Ieda et al. teaches a device of particular relevance to the claimed invention (U.S. Pat. No. 6,933,831)..

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Rutland-Wallis whose telephone number is 571-272-5921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MRW

Lynn D. Feild
LYNN D. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER